

Portland, OR 97204

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 5578-58206/RJP 3749 03/05/2001 Mark W. Publicover 09/800,273 EXAMINER 7590 05/20/2005 KLARQUIST SPARKMAN CAMPBELL DONNELLY, JEROME W LEIGH & WHINSTON, LLP PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT One World Trade Center, Suite 1600 121 S.W. Salmon Street 3764

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		E
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/800,273	PUBLICOVER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jerome W Donnelly	3764
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r reply within the statutory minimum of thin iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	his action is non-final.	• .
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s65-71 is/are pending in the application	ation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) 65-7/is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	sian priority under 35 LLS C. 8	\$ 119(a)-(d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	agn priority under 55 5.5.5.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received in A	pplication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	priority documents have been	received in this National Stage
application from the International Bur	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.
		JEROME W. DONNELLY PRIMARY EXAMINER
Attachment(s)		
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> </ol>		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB	/08) 5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	<u>_</u> .

Application/Control Number: 09/800,273

**Art Unit: 3751** 

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 65-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey.

Bailey discloses a trampoline device comprising a frame, a plurality of legs extending upwardly from the frame a mat coupled to the frame by a plurality of springs, and expanse of flexible material supported by such independent poles.

Bailey however does not disclose his device as specifically five to eight feet above the rebounding mat surface.

The examiner notes however that in view of the standard distance between of Bailey shown in fig. 1 and that to take the height of the ladder and compare it to the height of the poles shown in fig. 1 the pole members would fall into a height range of about five to eight feet.

As to applicants claims of the poles being independent the claims are so broad so as to read on every other pole member of the device, so as to encompass the language of independent.

As to applicants claims in claim 65 as to one end of each of the pole members terminating at an end positioned above the mat and one end terminating below said

Art Unit: 3751

mat, and as to claim 70 wherein at least one of the poles has both ends positioned below the rebounding mat, the examiner notes that it is unclear as to how each of the ends of claim 65 can be positioned as claimed in claim 65 and as positioned in claim 70.

The examiner further notes that to manufacture inverted U-shaped frame/pole members of separate vertical members and horizontal members is shown and made obvious in view of the disclosure of Coin et al element 32 and 34. The inverted U-shaped of Bailey meets the language of claim 65 if manufactured in a inverted U-shape as disclose by the sectional manufactured U-shape of Coan et al, there by having ends which terminate above the mat surface.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerome Donnelly at telephone number (571) 272-4975.

Donnelly/PJ

5/9/05

JEROME W. DONNELLY PRIMARY EXAMINER